

REMARKS

Page 1 of the specification is amended to add the serial numbers of the related applications.

Claim 1 is amended in response to an indefiniteness rejection and claims 10-16 are amended to improve clarity. Claim 17 is amended to add the feature "wherein a level of trust associated with the indications depends upon a first condition of the one or more first conditions", which is supported by at least claim 1 as originally filed. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-21 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**Claim 1**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. In response, claim 1 is amended to recite antecedent basis.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**Claims 1-17 and 19-21**

Claims 1-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the reference "Decentralized Trust Management" (hereinafter "Blaze" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,467 (hereinafter Gong). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

receiving at least a second condition and a second element of evidence, wherein the second condition is associated with the permission set and a level of trust associated with the second element is dependent upon the first condition. (emphasis added)

1 The Office Action asserts that the "first condition" and the "first evidence"
2 recited in claim 1 are satisfied by Blaze because Blaze discloses "A's verifiable
3 digital signature on B's key is the condition, and A's public/private key pair is
4 evidence".

5 The Office Action also asserts that the "second condition" and the "second
6 evidence" recited in claim 1 are satisfied by Blaze because Blaze discloses "A to
7 verify trustworthiness of B's key is condition, and digital signature of A is
8 evidence."

9 Applicants respectfully traverse. The level of trust associated with the
10 digital signature of A (what the Office Action terms the "second evidence") does
11 not depend on A's verifiable digital signature on B's key (what the Office Action
12 terms the "first condition"). Rather, Blaze explicitly discloses on page 2, second
13 column, lines 5-9:

14 a user may specify the *degree of trust* that he has in
15 each introducer; an individual may be designated
16 *unknown, untrusted, marginally trusted, or completely*
17 *trusted*. Each user stores his trust information ..."
(emphasis original).

18 Thus, Blaze discloses that the level of trust is determined by the user, which
19 is not dependent upon what the Office Action terms as the "first condition". Gong
20 is cited as disclosing a means for secure class resolution, loading and definition.

21 Therefore, the cited combination of Blaze and Gong does not teach or
22 suggest the feature, "a level of trust associated with the second element is
23 dependent upon the first condition", as recited in claim 1. Because the cited
24 combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the cited
25 combination fails to make out a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 1.

1 Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10 are patentable over the cited
2 references.

3 Claim 11 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
4 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
5 that claim 11 and dependent claim 12 are patentable over the cited references for at
6 least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

7 Claim 13 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
8 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
9 that claim 13 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that
10 claim 1 is patentable.

11 Claim 14 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
12 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
13 that claim 14 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that
14 claim 1 is patentable.

15 Claim 15 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
16 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
17 that claim 15 and dependent claim 16 are patentable over the cited references for at
18 least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

19 Claim 17 as amended recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a
20 second element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants
21 respectfully assert that claim 17 and dependent claims 19-21 are patentable over the
22 cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

23 Claim 18
24
25

1 Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Blaze
2 in view of Gong and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,678 (hereinafter Itoh).
3 Applicants respectfully traverse.

4 Claim 18 depends from amended claim 17. As discussed above, Blaze and
5 Gong do not render amended claim 17 obvious. Itoh is cited as disclosing a problem
6 solving apparatus using state transition. However, Applicants respectfully assert that
7 this disclosure does not overcome the deficiencies of Blaze and Gong in the rejection
8 of claim 17. Consequently, the cited combination of Blaze, Gong and Itoh do not
9 teach each and every element of claim 17 and, thus, fails to make out a prima facie
10 case of obviousness. Accordingly, claim 17 is also patentable over the combination
11 of Blaze, Gong and Itoh. As claim 18 depends from claim 17, claim 18 is patentable
12 over Blaze, Gong and Itoh for at least the reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

13
14 **CONCLUSION**

15 In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe all
16 pending claims are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is
17 respectfully requested.

18 Respectfully Submitted,

19
20 Dated: _____

21 By: _____
22 Lawrence E. Lycke
23 Reg. No. 38,540
24 (206) 315-4001 x103
25